

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Junior F. Dehoyos, #98229-198)	
)	C/A No.: 8:08-cv-2136-GRA
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
John LaManna, Warden,)	(Written Opinion)
and Rodney E. Rogers)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	


This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's letter asking this Court to reconsider its March 20, 2009, dismissal of his § 1983 action without prejudice for failing to exhaust administrative remedies. After a review of the record, this Court reaffirms its prior decision.

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *See Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *See Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982). Based on the mandate to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, this Court will treat Plaintiff's letter to the Court as a Motion for Reconsideration.

After a thorough review of the record, this Court finds that its prior decision was and is correct as a matter of law. The Court appropriately adopted the magistrate's Report and Recommendation. Consequently, this Court must deny Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


G. Ross Anderson, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

June 9, 2010
Anderson, South Carolina